

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

DYNAMIC MACHINE WORKS INC.,)	
Plaintiff)	
)	
vs)	Docket No. 04-10525-WGY
)	
MACHINE & ELECTRICAL)	
CONSULTANTS, INC.)	
Defendant)	

Affidavit of Jack Grosberg

I, Jack Grosberg hereby depose and say the following:

1. I am the President of Oxford Engineering Company, Inc. ("Oxford"), 2 Red Barn Road, Oxford, Connecticut 06478. I have personal knowledge of the matters contained herein.
2. I have been engaged in various manufacturing engineering capacities for approximately forty (40) years. My primary experience for the past twenty-three (23) years has been in the precision optical and laser calibration of linear displacement of machinery.
3. On or about November 1, 2003, Oxford was engaged by Machine & Electrical Consultants, Inc. ("MECI"), 17 Pomerleau Street, Biddeford, Maine 04005 to perform alignment verification of a certain Johnford HT-275G CNC Turning Center ("Johnford Lathe") to be commissioned at Dynamic Machine Works Inc. ("Dynamic"), 12 Suburban Park Drive, Billerica, Massachusetts 01821.
4. During the MECI commissioning process, my engineer and I worked directly with representatives of MECI and Dynamic in an effort to bring the Johnford Lathe into compliance with the accuracy standards set forth in the MECI Machine Specifications. A copy of these specifications are attached hereto as Exhibit "A".
5. After taking initial measurements of the Johnford Lathe, we determined that the headstock was significantly misaligned and did not conform with industry standards for this equipment. A copy of Oxford's test report showing these initial measurements is attached hereto as Exhibit "B". There was no evidence that the misalignment was as a result of damage in shipment.
6. Following re-alignment of the headstock, Oxford conducted multiple alignment tests over a three (3) week period which measured:

- (A) Tailstock ways and tailstock position in relation to headstock (Axis A). A copy of Oxford's test report showing the best and final measurements attained is attached hereto as Exhibit "C". The Johnford Lathe failed to meet the MECI technical standard of $\pm .0005$ " full stroke.
- (B) Positional accuracy of the ways of the cutting tool turret (Axis B) in relation to a "best fit" line for Axis A. A copy of Oxford's test report showing the best and final measurements attained is attached hereto as Exhibit "D". The Johnford Lathe failed to meet the MECI technical standard of $\pm .0005$ " full stroke.

All reported test measurements on Exhibit "C" (Axis A) begin at 80" from the face of the headstock since the tailstock could not be positioned any closer to the headstock.

- 7. Numerous attempts were made by MECI representatives to align the Johnford Lathe to the degree of accuracy set forth in the MECI Technical Specifications without success.
- 8. In my opinion, the Johnford Lathe was not capable of, nor could it be made to hold positional accuracy of $\pm .0005$ " over the entire stroke of the machine.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury this day of April, 2004.

S/Jack Grosberg

Jack Grosberg, President
Oxford Engineering, Inc